In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of April 1, 2008, which was made Final.

At the time of the Office Action claims 1-21 were pending. All claims were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Nachman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027474).

Applicants again respectfully submit that Nachman does not disclose nor suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention. However, the amendment to independent claims 1, 20 and 21 are intended to more clearly define features of the present invention, and render moot the analogies made by the Examiner between the present invention and the method disclosed in Nachman. Applicants submit that as described in the present application, the embodiments of the present invention introduce a confidence component between a non-confidence application and the second unit. Also, when an application, such as an applet, is downloaded from the second unit, such as a server, the application is considered as a confident application (See, for example, paragraphs 0024 and 0029 of the corresponding published application). Hence, Applicants submit that the messaging applet disclosed by Nachman cannot reasonably be considered as corresponding to an application of the first family requiring posing a question to the user.

Applicants further respectfully submit that in the claimed embodiments of the present invention the first unit comprises two families of applications. Also, the second unit is able to determine whether received data are coming from an application of the first or the second family. For that purpose, the second unit is able to check the conditions under which the data received are transmitted by the first unit. In the application, such a condition of transmission as described in, for example, paragraph 0006 of the published application. These conditions are, for example, the conformity of data packets with a protocol format (UDP, TCP).

Also, Applicants respectfully submit that in Nachman, no distinction is made between families of applications. However, in the claimed embodiments of the present invention, the claims recite that the first unit comprises two families of applications, and the claims also recite how these families are defined.

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

Applicants further respectfully submit that Nachman completely fails to disclose a distinction between the applications, based on their communication capacities or based on the confidence the second unit has in the data coming from them. On the contrary, in the claimed embodiments of the present invention, applications of the first family (which should not be trusted by the second unit) can communicate data to the second unit and being trusted by the second unit because these data (i.e., the response to the question to the posed to the user) is obtained by the confident component (which belongs to the second family of applications) and is transmitted by this same confident component. As discussed in the Remarks of the Response to the first Office Action, Nachman cannot disclose nor suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention because the messaging applet cannot be considered as an application of the first family. On the contrary, as described in, for example, paragraphs 0024-0029 of the published application, applets are applications of the second family and are trusted by the second unit.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Nachman does not indicate that the web server checks the data coming from the communication terminals of the users. On the contrary, in the claimed embodiments of the present invention, the server is able to determine whether data are coming from an application of the first of the second family (See, for example, paragraph 0059 of the published application). When data is coming from an application of the second family, as the second unit has confidence in the data, it proceeds further in the interaction with the first unit. Whereas, when data is coming from an application of the first family, as the second unit has not confidence in the data, the second unit stops the interaction with the first unit. To achieve this, the applications of the first family have a means for enabling the second unit to have confidence in the data they transmit. Thus, the claimed embodiments of the present invention achieve this by obtaining the response to the question to be posed to the user by the confidence components.

Accordingly, as demonstrated above, since Nachman does not describe a communication between an application that transmits data in which the server has not confidence, Nachman cannot disclose a solution for such an application for transmitting data to the server and being trusted by the server. Hence, for at least the above reasons, all claims should be allowable.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
Response to Final Office Action of April 1, 2008

Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Joseph J. Buczynski, Reg. No. 35,084
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: June 30, 2008

CH01/ 12527434.1

8